

BACONIANA.

VOL. XIII. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1915. No. 49.

FRANCIS BACON.

BORN 22ND JANUARY, 1562.

"Lord Bacon was the greatest genius that England or perhaps any other country ever produced."—POPE.

"The wisest, greatest of mankind."—HALLAM.

TO-DAY is the 354th Anniversary of the birth of Francis Bacon.

No one can understand or appreciate Bacon who does not realise that he was, before everything else, a Jester. Ben Jonson, when speaking of him, makes this plain. He says:—"His language was nobly censorious when he could spare or pass by a jest." So his normal mental habit was that of a Jester. Macaulay confirmed this when he said:—"In wit, if by wit he meant the power of perceiving analogies between things which appear to have nothing in common, Bacon never had an equal, not even Cowley, not even the author of *Hudibras*. . . . Occasionally it obtained the mastery over all his other faculties and led him into absurdities into which no dull man could have fallen." It is unfortunate that not one of Bacon's biographers has realised this fact. The result is that the real Bacon has

never been revealed. He is called "the father of the Inductive Philosophy." He is represented as being the founder of a system of Philosophy as was Descartes or Herbert Spencer. In the *Novum Organum* Book I, chap. CXVI. he distinctly repudiates such a designation:—"For this (founding a new sect in Philosophy) is not what I am about, nor do I think it matters much to the fortunes of men what abstract notions one may entertain concerning nature and the principles of things. . . . But for my part I do not trouble myself with any such speculative and withal unprofitable matters."

Spedding in his introductory chapter to "Letters and Life of Lord Bacon," gives an entirely misleading idea of Bacon's early life. He writes, "There is no reason to suppose that he was regarded as a wonderful child. Of the first sixteen years of his life indeed nothing is known that distinguishes him from a hundred other clever and well disposed boys." This is not in accordance with contemporary testimony.

The earliest biographical notice of Bacon is to be found prefixed to the French edition of his *Histoire Naturelle*, published in Paris in 1631. The author is presumably Pierre Amboise, to whom the license to print was granted. The following is a translation of a passage which occurs in it:—"Capacity (*jugement*) and memory were never in any man to such a degree as in this man; so that in a very short time he made himself conversant with all the knowledge he could acquire at college.* And though he was then considered capable of understanding the most important affairs (*capable des charges les plus importantes*), yet so that he should not fall into the usual fault of

* He left Cambridge before he had completed his fifteenth year.

young men of his kind (who by a too hasty ambition often bring to the management of great affairs a mind still full of the crudities of the school), M. Bacon himself wished to acquire that knowledge which in former times made Ulysses so commendable, and earned for him the name of Wise ; by the study of the manners of many different nations. I wish to state that he employed some years of his youth in travel in order to polish his mind and mould his opinions by intercourse with all kinds of foreigners. France, Italy, and Spain as the most civilised nations of the whole world, were these whither his desire for knowledge (*curiosité*) carried him."

Macaulay described Bacon as possessing "the most exquisitely constructed intellect that has ever been bestowed on any of the children of men." A contemporary writer thus speaks of him:—"He had a large mind from his father and great abilities from his mother ; his parts improved more than his years ; his great fixed and methodical memory, his solid judgment, his quick fancy, his ready expression, gave high assurance of that profound and universal knowledge and comprehension of things which then rendered him the observation of great and wise men and afterwards the wonder of all. . . . At twelve his industry was above the capacity and his mind above the reach of his contemporaries."

His grandfather, Sir Anthony Cooke, was tutor to Edward VI. Sir Anthony is said to have been "somebody in every Art, and eminent in all, the whole circle of Arts lodging in his soul. . . . Knowing that souls were equal and that Women are as capable of learning as men, he instilled that to his daughters at night, which he had taught the Prince in the day, being resolved to have sons by education for fear he should have none by birth and lest he wanted an heir

of his body, he made five of his mind." The mother of Francis Bacon was the second of these daughters. She was distinguished as a classical scholar. The boy's early education was directed by Sir Anthony, At the time of his birth (1560) the English language was without syntax or form and poverty stricken in vocabulary. He would acquire Latin and probably Greek from his cradle. The boy must have thought in Latin. The sources from which he was absorbing all knowledge were written in Latin, with some exceptions, which were in Greek. There was no English language in which he could think of that which he read. It may be said that, as was the case with Montaigne, Latin was his mother tongue. The course of his studies is thus described :—"He, after he had survaied all the records of antiquity after the volumnes of men, betook himselfe to the study of the volumne of the world, and having conquered whatever books possest set upon the Kingdome of Nature and carried that victory very farre." There exists evidence in his own handwriting, to be attributed probably to the time when he was 16 or 17 years of age, that he was proficient in the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldæic, Syriac and Arabic languages. It will probably be found that when in France young Bacon was assisting certain French printers just as Philip Melancthon, when he was about the same age, was working for Thomas Anshelmus at Tubingen. It was at this time that his portrait was painted by Hilliard, the Court Miniature Painter, who inscribed around it the words, "*Si tabula daretur digna animum mallet,*" freely translated, "If one could only find materials worthy to paint his mind."

But this wonderful boy was self-reliant with fearless independence. He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, when twelve years of age. He there took

exception to the course of education which was pursued. "He first fell into a dislike of the Philosophy of Aristotle; not for the worthlessness of the author, to whom he would ever ascribe all high attributes, but for the unfruitfulness of the way; being a philosophy (as he used to say) only strong for disputations and contentions, but barren of the production of works for the benefit of the life of man." This boy opposed his opinion to the authority of the staff of the University on the most fundamental point which could be raised as to the pursuit of knowledge and he left Cambridge without taking a degree before he was fifteen years of age.

What a remarkable boy this body of testimony reveals! He possessed the most exquisitely constructed intellect that was ever bestowed on any of the children of men. He was a brilliant wit, a born jester; so abnormally were these characteristics developed in him that they obtruded themselves in all that he did to the hindrance frequently of his pursuits. So extraordinary were his powers for acquiring knowledge that at twelve years of age his industry was above the capacity, and his mind above the range of his contemporaries. He had taken all knowledge to be his province and was then the observation of wise men as he became afterwards the wonder of all.

Records of his connection with two properties in which he was interested reveal another trait in his character.† He was irresponsible so far as money matters were concerned. There is an entry in the State papers, 1608, January 31st. Grant at the suit of Sir Francis Bacon to Sir William Cooke, Sir John Constable and three others of the King's Rever-

† These interesting facts were brought to light by Mr. Harold Hardy.

sion of the estates in Hertfordshire. Sir Nicholas, to whom it had descended from the Lord Keeper, conveyed the remainder to Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors, "with the condition that if he paid £100 the grant should be void, which was apparently done to prevent the said Sir Francis to dispose of the same land which otherwise by law he might have done." There is another instance of a similar kind. When Lady Anne Bacon conveyed the Markes estate to Francis it was subject to a like condition, namely, that the grant was to be null and void on Lady Anne paying him ten shillings. This condition made it impossible for Francis to dispose of his interest in the estate, and so it came about that in a letter written by Anthony Bacon to his mother, dated 16th of April, 1593, he urges her to concur in a sale so that the proceeds may be applied to the relief of his brother's financial position. It is evident, therefore, that he would turn into money everything which he could. Hence the unusual provisions to safeguard him. And yet he writes to Lord Burghley:—"I cannot accuse myself that I am either prodigal or slothful, yet my health is not to spend nor my course to get." From his early manhood he was raising money in all directions. Burghley, the second founder of his poor estate, had been "carrying him on." His mother's resources were exhausted as early as 1589, for a Captain Allen writes of her:—"Also saith her jewels be spent for you, and that she borrowed the last money of seven several persons." How he was spending these sums is a mystery.

The assertion has been made that from his earliest years Bacon was an ignoble place seeker, and this charge has been again and again repeated by writers, ignorant of the true facts, until it has come to be generally accepted as true. But there is no justifica-

tion for it. Had he merely sought place under ordinary conditions, it is difficult to believe that it would have been withheld from him. Here was a brilliant young man, possessing exceptional abilities as a thinker, speaker and writer, the son of the Queen's trusted and honoured Lord Keeper, himself a *persona grata* with the Queen from his earliest years, the nephew of four of the most famous women of the time for learning, all of them married to men of influence and mark. By the marriage of the eldest of them, he became the nephew of Lord Burghley, the Lord Treasurer, who was, without doubt, the greatest power, after the Queen, in the Realm—surely a position with substantial emoluments might have been found for him if he was prepared to accept it on the terms upon which it might be offered! But during Elizabeth's reign he remained without advancement, and it was not until the third year of James I., when 46 years of age, that he received his first appointment, that of Solicitor General. Had he been a mere place hunter he would not have had to wait so long for recognition. True, it is that as early as 1580, when only 19, he had a suit to the Queen presented by Lord Burghley. But this suit was of an exceptional nature. In a letter to his uncle, he describes it as "rare and unaccustomed." It needed an apology lest it should appear "undiscreet and unadvised." He states his only hope to obtain it rests in Burghley's affection toward himself and grace with her Majesty, who, he adds, "methinks needeth never to call for experience of the thing, where she hath so great and so good of the person which recommendeth it." The suit was not granted, for in 1585 he was writing to Sir Francis Walsingham, asking his influence on its behalf. "I think," he says, "the objection of my years will wear away with the length of my suit." There is no evidence

as to what that suit was, but it is clear that it was of a very exceptional character, and that it was not connected with his estate or his profession. It has been suggested* that Bacon, fresh from France, may have been influenced by the great work which had been accomplished by the Pléiade, in building up the French language and literature, and desired, with the Queen's recognition and financial support, to undertake a similar enterprise for his own country.

There is another letter to Burghley, of special interest, written in 1592. The suit appears to have been abandoned, and he writes :—" I wax now somewhat ancient, one and thirty years is a good deal of sand in the hour glass." It is in this letter that he states that he has taken all knowledge to be his province, and this remarkable passage occurs :—" And if your Lordship will not carry me on, I will not do as Anaxagoras did, who reduced himself with contemplation unto voluntary poverty ; but this I will do ; I will sell the inheritance that I have, and purchase some lease of quick revenue, or some office of gain that shall be executed by deputy, and so give over all care of service and become some sorry bookmaker, or a pioner in that mine of truth which he (Anaxagoras) said, lay so deep." A bookmaker!

There are two sentences in this letter which throw somelight on Bacon's connection with Burghley. He addresses him as " the second founder of my poor estate," and later on says :—" if your Lordship will not carry me on." It is manifest, therefore, that up to the time Bacon was 32 years of age, Burghley had rendered him great financial assistance.

It was about the time when this letter was written that Bacon's intimacy with Essex commenced. One

* See the *Mystery of Francis Bacon*. R. Banks and Son, 1912.

of the earliest developments of this connection was that Essex put forward Bacon as a candidate for the Office of Attorney General, which it was expected would shortly become vacant. It was an unwise proceeding. The brothers Anthony and Francis, by their correspondence with men—Protestants and Catholics—whom they had met on their travels abroad, had established themselves as the Foreign Intelligence department of the country. Up to this time these services had been placed at the disposal of Burghley: now they were transferred to Essex. The intimacy was commenced by Francis, who, writing fourteen years after, says:—"for I did not only labour carefully and industriously in that he set me about, whether it were matter of advice or otherwise; but, neglecting the Queen's service, mine own fortune, and in a sort my vocation, I did nothing but advise and ruminate with myself to the best of my understanding, proportions and memorials of anything that might concern his Lordship's honour, fortune and service."

The great desire of Essex was to control the Queen. In his efforts to this end he used the Bacons and their foreign intelligence service. It is evident that if Essex could place Francis, who was closely attached to him, in the important position of Attorney General, it would strengthen his own power. Thomas Bodley in his autobiography states that he was driven from political life by a similar effort of Essex to obtain for him the position of Secretary of State, and insists on the danger of association with that nobleman. It was as much to the interest of Essex as it was to that of Bacon that the latter should obtain such an influential position. When the Grays Inn men heard of the proposal they ridiculed it, saying "he had never entered the place of battle"; that is, he had never held a brief. In

order to meet this objection a case was found for him, and he made his first pleading on the 25th of January, 1594, in the King's Bench. He acquitted himself so well that Burghley sent his Secretary "to congratulate unto him the first fruits of his public practice." It is clear, therefore, that up to his thirty-fourth year Bacon had not been practising as a lawyer, nor had he subsequently private practice of any account.

Bacon was elected a member of the Parliament which met on the 23rd November, 1584, representing Melcombe in Dorsetshire. He sat in each of the remaining four Parliaments which were summoned during the reign. These Parliaments were not of long duration. There was only one session, and on the conclusion of the business dissolution followed, and there were then no members until another Parliament was summoned, probably after the lapse of some years. The law had not, up to 1597, occupied much of Bacon's time, nor had his Parliamentary duties.

Up to this date no literary work had been published bearing his name. About 1589 he had written a short pamphlet entitled, "*Advertisement touching the Controversies of the Church of England*," but this was not published until 1640, when the Long Parliament was discussing similar questions to those raised in it. There exist in manuscript some slight fragments, styled "*Mr. Bacon in praise of Knowledge*," and a "*Discourse in praise of his Sovereign*," believed to have been written for use at an entertainment given to the Queen by Essex, on the 17th of November, 1592.

His pen produced a reply to the Jesuit Parsons "*Responsio ad edictum Reginae Angliæ*," which appeared in print in the *Resuscitatio*, in 1657, under the title of "*Observations on a Libel*." In this volume was also included a short tract, "*A True report of*

Dr. Lopez, his treason," which would be written in the year 1594. There is another fragment in manuscript preserved in the Gibson Papers in the British Museum called "*Bacon's Device,*" written for production at some entertainment before the Queen, attributed to the year 1595. All these bound together would make but a very small volume. They would be written without any appreciable tax on Bacon's time, for he was a rapid writer. Rawley says "with what celerity he wrote I can testify," and comments on his great industry, never losing a moment of time. At the end of his life, as in his earliest years, industry was recorded as one of his principal characteristics.

In 1597 appeared a tiny volume entitled "*Essayes. Religious Meditations. Places of perswasion and disswasion.*" The Dedication is signed Fran. Bacon—"To M. Anthony Bacon, his deare Brother." The first portion comprises ten short essays containing about 3,500 words. The "*Meditationes Sacrae*" is written in Latin, and covers twenty-eight pages, about the same space as that occupied by the Essays.

"*Of the Coulers of good and evill a fragment*" is printed on thirty-two pages, with about 160 words on each. The Essays do not contain one Latin quotation, but "The Coulers of Good and Evil" abound in them.

From 1572 to 1597 embraces a period of twenty-five years. Having regard to his abnormal development in 1572 it seems impossible to believe, that this period, when his faculties must have been at the zenith of their power, should be practically barren of works. If liberal allowance of the time required for everything that is known of his occupations during that period, be made not one year would be accounted for. Spedding says:—"He could at once imagine like a poet and execute like a clerk of the works." But there is no

record of any work up to the production of the essays which would justify such a comment, nor do they justify it.

Eight years after in 1605 was published "*The Two Bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and advancement of Learning, divine and humane.*" The author was then 45 years of age. Such information as there is of his occupations between 1597 and 1605 again leaves most of his time unaccounted for. Although "*The Two Books*" are addressed to King James, it is probable that they were written many years previously with the intention that they should be dedicated to Elizabeth. Had the "rare and unaccustomed" suit of 1580 been granted it is quite possible that this work would have appeared as the manifesto of the scheme. It contains only about 60,000 words, and the young man of twenty could have turned it out. without preparation or effort in a very short time. It is discursive, not always exact, and it was evidently written or dictated without reference to the authorities quoted. The author throughout was trusting to his memory. In 1604 was published a letter addressed to the Earl of Devonshire known as "*Sir F. Bacon, his Apologie in certain imputations concerning the late Earl of Essex*" and in the same year a pamphlet entitled, "*Certaine Considerations touching the better pacification of the Church of England,*" and in 1614 was printed "*The Charge of Sir F. Bacon touching Duells.*"

In 1606 Bacon became Solicitor General, and thenceforward until 1621 he was more or less occupied in State affairs. A contemporary biographer writes:— "In a word how sufficient he was may be conjectured from this instance, that he had the contrivance of all King James his designs, until the match with Spain." Still a man possessing such a genius for industry would be able to produce far more than would any

ordinary man. Spratt in his "History of the Royal Society" says that if Bacon had not the strength of a thousand men he had at least that of twenty men.

There is only one short period in Bacon's life in which his time appears to have been absorbed in public duties. On the 7th of May, 1617, he took his seat, accompanied by the Judges, most of the Nobility and other gallants, as Lord Keeper in the Court of Chancery. He was then in his fifty-seventh year. The King and Buckingham were in Scotland. In a letter to the latter on the 8th of June following he writes :—" This day I have made even with the business of the Kingdom for common justice. Not one cause unheard. The Lawyers drawn dry of all the motions they had to make. Not one petition unanswered. And this I think could not be said in our age before. This I speak not out of ostentation, but out of gladness when I have done my duty. I know men think I cannot continue if I should thus oppress myself with business. But that account is made. The duties of life are more than life, and if I die now I shall die before men are weary of me, which in our times is somewhat rare."

In 1609 was published in Latin *De Sapientia Veterum*. An English version under the title of *The Wisdom of the Ancients* was published in 1619. This again is a small book containing about 15,000 words. In 1612 a further edition of the *Essays* appeared, the number being increased to thirty-eight. In 1620, when he was sixty years of age, appeared the *Novum Organum*, no English translation of which was printed until the early part of the nineteenth century.

The *Cogitata et Visa*, of which the *Novum Organum* is an amplification, was written as early as 1607, for there is a letter from Thomas Bodley dated 19th February in that year acknowledging receipt of a

manuscript copy which he criticises. In this letter an extraordinary passage occurs. After commending Bacon's aims in the work Bodley says :—" Which course, would to God (to whisper so much in your ears) you had followed at first, when you fell to the study of such a thing as was not worthy such a student." *Cogitata et Visa* was not printed until many years after Bacon's death. *Novum Organum* is not a large volume, but it bears evidence of the expenditure of more labour in its preparation than do any of his other works. The remainder, by no means extensive, of his productions were according to Rawley the results of the last five years of his life. The most important, perhaps, is the *History of Henry VII.* This was not commenced until the end of June, 1621, and the completed manuscript was sent to the King in the following October. *The Two Books on the Advancement of Learning* were enlarged, written in Latin and published under the title of *De Dignitate et Augmentis Scientiarum*, in 1623. In 1622 appeared *Historia Ventorum*, in 1623 *Historia Mors et Vita*, in 1625 *Apophthegmes new and old*, *Translations of certaine Psalmes into English Verse*, and the final Edition of the *Essays*, and in 1627 *Sylva Sylvarum*, or a *Naturall Historie*, and *The New Atlantis*, which was left unfinished.

Only three works written in the English language were published during his lifetime :—*The Essays*, *The Two Books of the Advancement of Learning*, and *The History of Henry VII.* If they are judged by their quantity they are trivial productions. The *Sylva Sylvarum* which bears date the year following his death was written in English. It certainly does not enhance his literary reputation. *The Advancement of Learning* amplified from two to nine books published in Latin in 1623 as *De Augmentis Scientiarum* was not produced in English until 1640. It is stated in the

title page that in this edition *De Augmentis* is interpreted by Gilbert Wats. It is not a mere translation. The whole work appears to have been rewritten in the English language.

Bacon's desire was that all his works should be preserved for posterity in Latin, the universal language. In his time it was the language in which scholars conversed and corresponded, and in which therefore they could express new ideas. Isaac Cassauban, when he came to reside in England, could not speak a word of English. Yet he experienced no difficulty, as the King spoke French fluently and the Bishops and scholars whom he met conversed in Latin. The meaning which words in the English language were intended to convey might in time change, but the Latin language was settled. His audience in his own country was small. For an appeal to his contemporaries on the Continent, Latin was indispensable.

Bacon was right in his anticipation of the mutability of the English language. Two examples will suffice: he includes in the Sciences—History, Poesy, including the drama, Elocution, Conversation, Negotiation and Theology, none of which would to-day be classified under that designation; also the word Philosophy conveys now quite a different impression to that which was intended in the sense in which he used it. So it is that misconceptions have come about as to his "scientific pre-occupations" and his "system of philosophy." What is termed Bacon's "inductive philosophy" was simply his method of conducting investigation and acquiring knowledge.

An impartial survey of the man, his times, his recorded occupations, his professed objects and ideals must result in wonder as to the paucity of his literary output. Here was the most exquisitely constructed intellect which was ever bestowed on any of the children of

men, employed from early boyhood to the end of life, with an industry which was abnormal, by a man who early in life had surveyed all the records of antiquity after the volumes of men: and who having betaken himself to the study of the volume of the world had conquered whatever books possessed, who as an orator was so gifted that he commanded where he spoke and had his judges angry and pleased at his devotion, the fear of every man being lest he should make an end: and who had a wit which has never been equalled: who had filled up all numbers, and performed that in our tongue which may be compared or preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome, so that he may be named and stand as the mark and acme of our language! What has he handed down as the result of this marvellous industry?

The works which bear his name are discursive and fragmentary. The most complete is *The Advancement of Learning*. *Novum Organum* was never finished. Of his great Instauration, which he divided into six parts, only two parts can be traced and yet he speaks of five as being completed and expresses regret that he will not live to finish the sixth.

There is another curious feature of the man which attracts attention. Nowhere does he show the least concern for the spread of education amongst the masses or for the betterment of their conditions of life. He had in view always the advancement of learning, and the conquest of Nature by wresting her secrets from her and applying them for the benefit of mankind.

Except for his association with political life he seems to stand apart from his times. In his works he hardly mentions any of his contemporaries—Galileo, Gilbert and Bruno are referred to by name. Even if the works bearing his name be not included, the period during which he lived from, say, 1576 to 1626, is more brilliant

in the literature of England than any similar period in the history of any other country. And yet there is no visible trace of his connection with it. Is it possible that he could have lived through it and taken no part in it? And be it observed that period is exactly contemporaneous with his life.

The curious fact is that the attention of students is not directed in books written on the English literature of this period to its magnitude and value. The well-worn ruts are travelled over and over again. Certain dramatists and poets are worn threadbare, but the greater bulk of the books published in England from 1576 to 1626 are known only to book collectors and second-hand book-sellers, and their contents remain unexplored. Few of them have been reprinted and copies of the original editions are rare. In 1576 to an Englishman to whom "education had not given more languages than nature tongues" there were no channels through which he could obtain a general knowledge of the antiquities, the histories and geography of other countries or of his own, the customs of their people, their art, and what then passed for science. There were translations of only a few of the classics available. France, Italy and Spain were better supplied. But in 1626 all this was altered, and from books printed in English more knowledge and information could be obtained than from the combined Literatures of those countries.

There exists no evidence of any general interest in a revival of learning during this epoch. Certainly Oxford and Cambridge, the only two seats of learning, exhibit no evidence of its existence. Of Oxford at this period, Mark Patterson says:—"Of any special interest in science, learning, and the highest culture, there is no trace." Cambridge was given up to theological controversy. However thorough the search be, no-

where throughout the country will be found evidence of interest in this revival. And yet steadily was coming from the Press volume after volume, from large, ponderous folios to small octavos, translations and books on every conceivable subject. Where was the public creating the demand? The Bodley Library did not appear to require them, for few are to be found in the 1620 Catalogue. There was no demand for them from abroad, for the English language was unknown there. The cost of printing and publishing must have been enormous, to say nothing of recompense for the writers and translators. Of the solid literature, apart from theological controversial works published during the reigns of Elizabeth and James, it may be estimated, with safety, that not ten per cent. brought back from proceeds of sale one half of their cost. Large sums of money must have been provided by someone for the authors or translators, the printers and the publishers. There is no trace to be found in the records, printed or otherwise, of any man (with one exception) who took interest in the advancement of learning. But given the man with the inclination and the knowledge to pilot such a scheme, he must also have had the control of great wealth to enable him to carry it through.

There is another aspect of this question which is of importance. In the Proheme to a little volume, entitled :—*Of that Knowlage whiche maketh a Wise Man A Disputation Platonike* (1536), Sir Thomas Eliot states that in writing *The Governour*, he intended to augment our English tongue, “whereby men shoulde as well expresse more abundantly the thyng that they conceived in their hertes (wherfore language was ordeined) having wordes apte for the purpose; as also interpret out of Greke, Latin, or any other tonge into Englysshe, as sufficiently, as out of any one of the sayde tongues into another.” The Members of the

Pléiade adopted the same method in advancing the French language to a condition capable of expressing the highest emotions and thoughts. Now, either intentionally or as a natural consequence, the production of this literature in England had a similar effect on the English language. In 1576 it may be described as barbaric. Before 1626 *The Plays of Shakespeare* and *The Authorized Version of the Bible* had been produced, examples which Professor Saintsbury says "will ever be the twin monuments, not merely of their own period, but of the perfection of English, the complete expressions of the literary capacities of the languages."

There are other circumstances which suggest a superintending direction in the production of these books. The movement of the work from printer to printer :— Henry Bynneman, George Bishop and Richard Field were at first employed, then Adam Islip and George Eld became active, and at the end of the period William Jaggard and John Haviland were the chief producers. There appears to have been a definite scheme of printers blocks of special designs used as head-pieces and tail-pieces to ear-mark these books. The identical block used by George Bishop in 1584, as the first initial letter in *The French Academy*, was used by John Haviland as the first initial letter in the 1625 Edition of Bacon's *Essays*. The identical block used by Richard Field on the title-page of *Venus and Adonis*, in 1593, was used by Christopher Barker on the title-page of the Genealogical Tables of the first quarto of *The Authorized Version* in 1612. In the one case the block was preserved for 39 years, in the other case for 17 years. Moreover, some of these designs were re-engraved and used in books printed in France, which apparently form part of the same scheme. The Emblem literature of the period contains what appear to be definite references to several of these designs. This extraordinary litera-

ture appears to be absolutely neglected by students, although it was clearly produced with some definite object. If Alciati's emblems published 50 years before be excluded this literature was mainly the product of the period.

There is another striking characteristic of these books. In the Dedications, the Prefaces and Addresses "To the Reader," will be found some of the finest examples of the English language extant. It would be difficult to select a more perfect specimen than the Dedication prefixed to the 1625 translation of *Barclay's Argenis*, to which the name of Kingsmill Long is attached. There is a peculiarity about these dedications. The writer, or the writers, must have been proficient in oratory. A writer who is not merely a good speaker but an orator, has a special style which is the result of instinct, and cannot be acquired. This instinct enables him to express his thoughts in words which give pleasure as their sound falls upon the ears of his auditors. It is no explanation to say that this was a style common to the period. It was not. The matter itself bears evidence that the writer, or writers, had a most comprehensive and familiar knowledge of classical and modern authors. The compilations abound in imagery. There are certain tricks of speech which can be recognised as those of an orator. Who were the men living at that time who could write such prose? If the number of names attached to these examples is to be taken as a guide, such stylists were plentiful as blackberries, but they never employed this style elsewhere. The writer of the preface to *Barclay's Argenis* and the translator of the Work, which is not, it may be remarked, a literal translation of the original, was a master of prose, but Kingsmill Long cannot be traced, and his name appears on no other work. Numbers of similar instances might be quoted.

The suggestion now made is that as early as 1576 someone conceived the idea of advancing the English language from a condition which may be described as little short of barbaric, to one in which it could stand for power of expression beside the classical languages, and at the same time of providing channels by which all knowledge was placed at the disposal of those who might employ that language. If such were the case, it was a magnificent scheme.

Would the result of a thorough investigation of the Elizabethan and Jacobean literature support this suggestion? Would it be worth while for some scholars possessing knowledge of the period to extend their knowledge by making such an important investigation? But they must undertake it with open minds and they must be prepared on sufficient evidence being produced to recant much that they have written.

If the result arrived at justified the adoption of this suggestion as a sound working hypothesis, the rest is plain sailing. There will be no difficulty in selecting the master mind which conceived the scheme. The author of *De Augmentis Scientiarum* and *Novum Organum* at every point meets the requirements. From his cradle he was enthused with a passion for acquiring knowledge and wresting from nature her secrets, possessing the most exquisite intellect which was ever bestowed on any of the children of men, and a capacity for industry which was unrivalled. *The Advancement of Learning* was his Manifesto. The production of a great literature, commencing in 1576 with *The Anatomie of the Mind*, was the means of the realization of his scheme. The many, many apparently fruitless years of his life are accounted for. The English Renaissance runs parallel with that life. When he passed away it was over. The conclusion of Ben Jonson's panegyric becomes intelligible :—" In short, within his view and

about his times, were all the wits born that could honour a language, or help study. Now things daily fall. Wits grow downward and Eloquence backwards: so that he may be nam'd and stand as the mark and acme of our Language."

Ben Jonson knew the difference between a Star, a group of stars as the Pléiade and a Constellation. Could he have had Bacon in his mind when he wrote :—

"But stay, I see thee in the Hemisphere
Advanc'd, and made a constellation there:
Shine forth, thou Starre of Poets."

The thought will naturally suggest itself, if Bacon carried out this great work, why did he so rigorously and effectively conceal his participation in it? Such a course was a mark of consummate wisdom. Without it innumerable obstacles and difficulties would have been encountered. It entailed considerable self-sacrifice, but it was a master-stroke of policy. Bacon left his fame to the next ages. Rawley concludes his introduction to the *Manes Verulamiani* with these words :—"Be this, moreover, enough, to have laid as it were, the foundations, in the name of the present age. Every age, methinks, will adorn and amplify this structure: though to what age it may be vouchsafed to set the finishing-hand, that is known only to God and to the fates." What was Rawley's meaning?

But there is another possibility. Bacon's connection with the Emblem literature is attested by Jean Baudoin, who translated the Essays and other works of his into French. The explanation may be found in it. On the frontispiece of Peacham's Emblems, styled *Britanna Minerva*, is a curious device. A hand holding a pen is protruding from a curtain concealing the figure of the writer. The pen has

written "Mente Videbor"—"By the Mind I shall be seen." Around the device are the words:—"Vivitur ingenio cetera mortis erunt"—"One lives in one's genius, other things shall pass away in death."

In 1612 John Owen published a book of epigrams. One is addressed—Ad D B. D stands for Dominum, B might, and probably does, stand for Bacon. It reads thus:—

"Si bene qui latuit, bene vixit, tu bene vivis :
Ingeniumque tuum grande latendo patet."

"Thou livest well if one well hid well lives,
And thy great genius in being concealed is revealed."

Bacon wrote, and repeated again and again:—

"For of the Knowledge which contemplate the works of Nature, the holy Philosopher hath said expressly; that the glory of God is to conceal a thing, but the glory of the King is to find it out; as if the Divine Nature according to the innocent and sweet play of children, which hide themselves to the end they may be found; took delight to hide his works, to the end they may be found out; and of his indulgence and goodness to mankind had chosen the Soule of Man to be his Playfellow in this game."

Bacon said:—"Dissimulation is a compendious wisdom." Is the explanation that he enveloped his work in anonymity? In divine playfulness he hid its source, being convinced that in the next ages his own personality glowing through the text would become revealed to the world at large. Is this the age to which it is vouchsafed to set the finishing hand to Francis Bacon's fame?

Hallam wrote:—"If we compare what may be found in the sixth, seventh and eighth books of the

De Augmentis, in the *Essays*, the *History of Henry VII.*, and the various short treatises contained in his works on moral and political wisdom, and on human nature with the rhetoric, ethics and politics of Aristotle, or with the historians most celebrated for their deep insight into civil society and human character—with Thucydides, Tacitus, Phillippe de Comines, Machiavel, Davila, Hume—we shall, I think, find that one man may almost be compared to all these together."

A writer in the *Edinburgh Review* said :—"Columbus, Luther and Bacon are, perhaps in modern times, the men of whom it may be said with the greatest probability that, if they had not existed, the whole course of human affairs would have been varied."

If the suggestion as to Bacon's life work now submitted be found upon investigation correct, the English language, rich as it is, will be barren in words to describe his colossal proportions. And yet this great man, "the greatest, wisest, of mankind," to quote Hallam's words, is neglected by his countrymen, whose indebtedness to him is incalculable. No fitting memorial has been raised to his memory. It is true that the benchers of Gray's Inn have erected a belated statue near to the site, where once stood his lodgings, but something more is surely due to his memory.

The most fitting memorial to Francis Bacon would be a library, in which were gathered together a copy of every volume which was published in England from 1560, the year in which he was born to, say, 1640, much of the French literature published during that period, and books printed in Holland and Belgium. It should also contain a copy of every edition of his work published in every language to the present time. It should also contain copies of all books written upon that period. It should also contain copies of all books of which Bacon or his works form the subject. Of these there

will be found more in the French language than in that of England. What a reference library that would be ! The volumes ranged round the room in cases representing each year, so that it would be possible more readily to grasp the gradual evolution of the Elizabethan and Jacobean literature. Valuable and useful as is the collection of books of this period in the British Museum, they are dispersed in so many different galleries to which the reader has no access that the difficulty of consulting them is very great. In the Bacon Memorial Library, the student should be able to go to the shelf and take down any books he requires for reference. If the collection of books was undertaken without advertisement or ostentation, with the exception of some rare volumes, the cost of procuring them would not be great. Money is found in abundance for projects far less worthy of support. Such a Library as this would be a boon to students of literature. It would add lustre to English culture. If Francis Bacon could have been consulted, it is probable that there is no form of memorial which would have been more in accord with his desires.

In the year 1916 will be celebrated the tercentenary of the death of his great contemporary, William Shakespeare. How opportune it would be if at the same time a Bacon Memorial Library could be established on these lines.

WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY.

DID BACON DIE IN 1626?

YOUR readers must be tiring of this enquiry, but so much is made more comprehensible if he did live some years longer that it is important to get at the real facts.

Amongst other things it gave him much-needed time to prepare further examples for investigation, conducted upon his new method serviceable for keeping the process vividly before men's minds. These examples were to form one of the divisions between the preliminaries of his philosophy and the philosophy itself.

Even the inductive working out of the problem of his death, or retirement, in 1626, was probably intended as one of the examples.

THE ARUNDEL LETTER.

It is very odd that not until 1702 was the Arundel letter forthcoming, when it was printed by Stephens the Historiographer Royal. It purports to have been written at Arundel House, formerly until its transfer to Earl Arundel, a country residence of Sir William and Lady Cornwallis, a place of summer entertainment upon the top of Highgate Hill, whence it commanded a splendid view of the surrounding country.

Francis Bacon was there to dine with Lady Arundel and friends in 1617. But he must have stayed there many times before.

Lady Cornwallis was by birth one of the Meautys family. Bacon's secretary, Thomas Meautys, was her cousin. They were grandchildren of Richard Cooke, brother of Bacon's reputed mother, Lady Anne, the second wife of Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas Bacon.

Sir William Cornwallis was a member of Queen

Elizabeth's Court, was knighted in Ireland in 1599 by Robert, Earl of Essex, and died about 1614.

In March, 1621-2 (as will be seen by a letter of Thomas Meautys to Francis, his employer) Bacon was permitted to come as near to the Verge as Highgate, and one may suspect that his friends, the Arundels, permitted him to reside there as conveniently near his London printers, booksellers and literary and political friends ; so that this casually repairing to Arundel House in 1626, when in the hands of a male caretaker or house-keeper only, is very suspicious, as there could hardly have been a more suitable place to die at if the death contemplated was a mere clever subterfuge.

If we can obtain more light upon Arundel House and the history of this letter (said to have come from Tobie Matthews' collection) so much the better.

ANOTHER SINGULAR LETTER.

I call attention to another letter on the last page of Vol. 12 of Montagu's " Life and Works of Bacon." It is printed by Montagu for the first time as a letter from Meautys to Bacon. It is signed J.M., and superscribed " For your noblest self my most honrd. lord." It refers to events which did not happen until 1631. Grounded upon its reference to Maxwell a writer on Palatinate affairs, and upon a curious letter from Bacon to the Queen of Bohemia printed in Baconiana 1679, I suspect that Bacon was in 1631 living at Rhenen in Holland as guest of that Queen.

THE ROSY CROSS.

I know of no better or more powerful line of investigation into the phenomena of Bacon's life than that taken by Mr. Harold Bayley in " The Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon," and it is my humble opinion that the more we can get behind the veil of this secret fraternity

for the advancement of religion as established in England, and of learning arts and sciences the nearer we shall be to our goal.

Ben Jonson, the friend, assistant and devoted admirer of Francis Bacon, made at least two references to the Rosy Cross Fraternity in his Masques. In "News from the New World," performed 1620, one of the masquers says:—

"The brethren of the Rosie Cross have their college within a mile of the moon, a castle in the air that runs upon wheels, with a winged lanthorn."

In "The Fortunate Isles," said to have been *designed* for the Court on the Twelfth Night (6th January), 1626-7 Johphiel, an airy spirit from the clouds, converses with Merefool, a melancholic student seeking the Rosy Cross brethren. (The Masque was probably never presented, and was not printed until 1641, after Jonson's death, or possibly not until the folio of 1692. At the moment I have no means of saying which date is correct.)

Johphiel says he has been sent to Merefool by Father Outis (Greek for Nobody), "he that built the castle in the air where all the brethren Rhodostaurotic (query a reference to rose coloured?) live. It flies with wings and runs on wheels."

Johphiel tells Merefool "All the brethren have heard your vows, salute you and expect you by me this next return. But the good father has been content to die for you."

Merefool: For me?

Johphiel: For you. Last New Year's day *as some give out*. . . . He would not live because he might leave all he had to you.

Merefool: What had he?

Johphiel: . . . The farm of the great customs.
. . . Then Constable of the Castle Rosy-cross

which you must be and Keeper of the whole Kabal with the seals.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Bacon is cryptically referred to in these Masques. "A winged lanthorn" Beacon (Bacon) and Lanthorn are similars. Winged seems to allude to Mercury. Bacon was often referred to as Mercury, the messenger of the Gods. Besides, who was the great Father of the learned fraternity for the advancement of learning, who was "*given out*" to have died last New Year's day, 25th March, 1626 (the Masque being designed for Twelfth Night some nine months later)? It could only have meant Bacon, and if Bacon had been really dead Jonson would not have joked thus.

Given out that he was dead. Most certainly, yes ; but in view of these many curious happenings can we safely say that in 1626 he was dead ?

PARKER WOODWARD.

THE STAGE FRANCIS BACON'S PROVINCE.

I.

“ He whose lips his hand in silence locks.”—*Ovid. Metam.*

THE turpitude of the stage, past and present, its great possibilities, present and future, and its New Birth in Time as a *Novum Ogranum* created for the instruction of man in virtue, each had its own place in the vast contemplative ends of Francis St. Alban, sent headlong into the Theatre of this world, 22nd January, 1561.

Henry VIII, Mary and Elizabeth Tudor, James and Charles Stuart, were all lovers of the Drama. One of them certainly was a past mistress in that Art, of which not one person of their Courts had keener critical appreciation, more profound knowledge, and more practical experience than Francis Bacon.

We have only to read in Charles Isaac Elton's *Family and Friends of Shake-Spear* his description of Bacon's *Masque of Flowers*, to see how artistic was the scenery and complicated the machinery, how gorgeous the dresses, how exquisite the colours, music, singing, and dancing, while in Bacon's Essay on *Masques and Triumphs* he certainly does more than suggest his love and understanding of such subtleties. Not only in Greenwich Palace, Whitehall, or Gray's Inn do we trace this clever Contriver's affection for, and interest in, Dramatic Shows, but we also note his many allusions to the Stage even in his most serious moments. He draws his most brilliant similies from it. During his charge in the great poisoning trial, when the Somersets were harangued by His Majesty's Attorney-General, he paints the crime as a “ Tragedy,” in which

appears a "Principal Actor," a "Mechanical," as he takes care to explain in technical stage language "not the author." Perfecting the comparison by adding: "The great frame of Justice, my Lords, in this action, hath a vault, and it hath a Stage. A vault wherein these works were contrived, and a Stage with steps, by which they were brought to light. "The time for the Tragedy to be acted," It's "last Act," and the "part played by the King" are each mentioned separately, and at the close of his speech he says: "Where I speak of a Stage, I doubt I hold you upon the Stage too long."

Out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh. The Stage and its Craft was Francis Bacon's Province, and his mind naturally reverts to it at all times, in all seasons.

Like St. Augustine in his *City of God*, Francis in his *De Augmentis* ponders upon the present and future of the Theatre. In its translation by Watts, p. 69 is written: "Dramatical Poesy which brings the world upon the Stage is of excellent use—if it were not abused."

A strong expression, "*excellent use*" which he further strengthens by adding: "For—the Instruction of the Stage may be great." This is the identical view taken by Augustine, who deplores wasted opportunities for moral teaching in the Sacrificial Shows acted before the Gods with shameless disregard of decency.

Augustine and Francis were both Lovers of God by virtue of their Philosophy and Religion, so they not only surveyed the vices and errors of their times with regret, but with earnest desire to heal Mankind of them. So much alike in spiritual acumen and practical level-headedness it seems to me that they both saw the Stage as it were a Ladder reaching up to the

Heavenly City, with angel ministers of grace ascending and descending upon it.

Elton says in his *Family and Friends of Shake-spear*, "Francis Bacon, who wrote 'The Essence of the Masque is Pomp and Glory,' was the man who understood the business as well as a Professional." And this man, being born for "Philanthropia," set to work his hardest to make the most excellent use possible of the Stage. Firstly, he tells us what was wrong with it in those early Elizabethan days. It was but a sport or pastime, or else too bitter in its satire. He says: "that corruptions abounded, and its discipline was altogether neglected," by which word "discipline" I gather he meant the Art and Science necessary to make the Theatre of any real profit to Man. He missed *God's Judgments*, destined to become such an important factor in the new Stage-Plays, which now began to hold their audiences at the Theatre, Curtain, Fortune, and later at the Globe, each new play exactly filling the requirements of Francis Bacon Philosopher, Moralist, and Dramatic Critic.

I thoroughly recognise it is one thing to show that Bacon deplored deficiency with regard to the Stage-Plays of his day, and quite another to claim for him the authorship of the Shake-Speare folio of 1623; but when Francis Bacon discovered a disease, he most certainly undertook the remedy, and in this present case I have particularly strong evidence for believing he did so. After having reported badly on Dramatical Poesy as it existed he adds this significant passage: "If any portion of these works which we report as *Deficient* chance to be more obscure than ordinary, we propose . . . Examples for the perfecting of that work; lest perchance some should imagine that our conceit hath only comprehended some light notions of them, and that we, like Augures,

only measure Countries in our mind, but know not how to set one foot forward thither." The word *obscure* as Bacon uses it here, and as Locke uses it, means, as Johnson's Dictionary tells us, "a negative idea lying in obscurity, too large for a finite capacity."

The Stage-Plays required by our Dramatic Critic were so totally out of the "ordinary," that they required Examples and Precepts from his pen to render the notion "TO BE SATISFACTORILY UNDERSTOOD BY IMPERFECT INTELLECTS."* So the folio of 1623 was produced, edited by Bacon's own friend and secretary, Ben Jonson, and it will stand for all ages as the perfect Example of an Art that conceals Art, and instructs the mind of Man in Virtue.

When Francis Bacon produced the Examples he promised, he withheld their authorship from the public, thereby setting up a stumbling block to some enquirers, but let them read what else he has to say about Poesy. That it is: "a way how to teach," and also "an art how to conceal," and that "one use of Poesy tendeth to the folding up of those things, the dignity whereof deserves to be retired and distinguished with a *drawn curtain*," and let them mark that he particularly says it veils "the secrets and mysteries of Religion, Policy, and Philosophy."

True it is that—

"He whose lips his hand in silence locks"

knows best the why and wherefore of his actions.

Augustine commends the Tragedies and Comedies of the Ancients as being the most tolerable of their Stage-Plays, being as he says: "Poetical Fables, wherein all the words were honest, and these the old men do cause to be taught to their children amongst their most honest and liberal studies." Francis Bacon

*See "obscure." Johnson's Dictionary.

was, as I believe, the Translator of the Second Edition of Augustine's *City of God*, published 1620, and dedicated to the Three Most Noble Brothers, William, Earl of Pembroke, (Lord Chamberlain,) Thomas, Earl of Arundel, and Philip, Earl of Montgomery. The anonymous editor states that the Second Edition has been "compared with the Latin Original, and is in very many places corrected and amended." It contains the copious, Learned Comments of Io. Lodovicus Vives, whose notes are a perfect mine of interest, including those on the Terence and Plautus Comedies, and their Knaveries and Tricks of Love; and on the old Tragedies, described as "that discourse of lamentable Fortunes, extreme effects, and horrible villainies, delighting much the uncleanly and slovenly gods." Baconian language and ideas abound, and as Bacon tells us in his *De Augmentis*: "Wise men and great Philosophers have accounted the Stage as the Archet or musical bow of the mind," we are not surprised to find St. Augustine devoting pages to the subject.

The term gods for our Theatre gallery-goers, the classic Porticoes and pillars, the horse-shoe form of our Theatres, our Tragedies and Comedies themselves, have an origin in the Temple and its Sacrificial Shows, Fables and Mysteries, once offered to the gods. Adapted to modern uses for the benefit of Man by him who took all *knowledge* for his province, was the "acme of our language," and has "done that for our tongue which may be compared or preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome." Preferred? yes! for Augustine says: "The pagan Gods did never establish the doctrine of *living well*, but contrariwise (such a Baconian word) gave free permission to enter . . . upon the mind itself horrible and abominable evils." "Let them show," he says:

"wherever they had any Public Places where the people might come and hear their gods doctrine concerning the restraint of covetousness, the suppression of ambition, the bridlings of luxury and riot, where they might learn that which *Perseus* thunders into men, saying :

" Learn wretches and conceive the course of things
What man is, and why Nature forth him brings.
.....
How to use money, how to give to friends,
What we in earth, and God in us intends."

Our Hercules, our Orpheus, our Apollo, our Love-God Cupid said : " Theatres and the like are honourable things," and again : " Happy is the man both in regard of heavenly and earthly wisdom, that is *wounded to be cured*." Taking for his arrow and his lancet Minerva's Spear; he shakes it with one hand, while with the other he " admits the true beams of Vice and Virtue " into a sincere and polished looking-glass of his own making. * "That the offender seeing his own counterfeit in this Mirror might amend it." Minerva, who like Harpocrates and Francis Bacon lays her finger on her lip.

Hail ! Pallas masked under the vizard of Pleasure.
Hail ! Genius of Francis, Hail !

†Pallas, Wisdom's wonder, Fount of Ethereal light !
Essence in Gods and men surmounting bright !
Tow'ring beyond the Spheres, and all in fire
Throned above Jove, far brighter and far higher !

* Thos. Lodge. " An Alarum against Usurers."

† *City of God*, p. 158.

PART II.

"From Art and Science true contentment springs,
Science points out the Cause, and Art the use of things."

Universal Magazine, 1791.

Amongst his favourite flowers, on smooth lawns watered by silvery Thames, Francis the Jester studied Law. What, Equity? Common Law? No! Most uncommon Law, if we are to trust his account; different, indeed, to that law practised in Westminster in Term Time. He turned a cold shoulder to the Plague stricken City, the great velvet boughs of his cedars stretched themselves above him, swans floated reflected in the ornamental water by which he rested, while in green sequestered alleys, woodbine and wild thyme mingled their perfume with jesting and laughter. Law at Twickenham for the Merry Tales was the study of our light-hearted Philosopher, who gained by it this practical experience, that with plague not many miles distant, men, even in a grieved state of mind, yet cannot sometimes forbear laughing.

Our laughing Philosopher relished merriment keenly, in season and out of season, if puns in letters to Kings and Princes are any guide. It was good, he said, to be merry and wise, and to mingle jest with earnest, and conversation lost for him its taste when shorn of humour. Oh! give me leave to be merry, he cried, however the world goes with me!

Children knew him for what he was, if no one else did. They sweetened his labour, and had his sympathy. And great Philosopher that he was, he could feel and think as a child. Some child-mindedness (he shyly confesses) is in me.

The little girl, busy about her dolls, innocent little ones blowing their soap-bubbles or playing hide-and-seek, the toddling boy a tip-toe after a bird, all young things that have a young, cheerful and dancing time, attract him because he has secret sympathy with Nature in all her moods, and even the baby hand gathering rose-leaves, to make a purse of them only to be broken on his broader hand, shares his interest.

If ever there stepped one who took for his pattern God, it was Francis, who says it pleaseth Him to apply Himself to the capacity of the simplest. And all the while our laughing Philosopher jested while he prayed for his fellow men: "God give you Joy!" for his mind's keen eye saw the exceeding need there was for it in this mad world. He surveyed this insane world by a beam from heaven, which brought the conviction to his soul that to him was given the task to set this mad world right, that he was born for *Philanthropia*, and for the relief of Man's estate. Also that a Store-House rich in knowledge was no longer to be hugged close under lock and key, but was to be put in action to the Glory of God.

The great Architype must be sought, beheld and gazed upon, and his Attributes and Acts, as far as they are revealed to Man, held up to imitation. The Light of Nature and Experience, his own eternally, must be dedicated by him to the Works and Creatures of God, for without light there is no vision, and light, above all things excels in comforting the spirits of men. He must set up in a fair room one great Light, or a branching candlestick of lights: though in his humility he finds himself of insufficient worth to be its candle holder. And those lights must all, for benefit, converge on an ill soul, or a holy one, as the case may be.

And our laughing Philosopher did set up a great Light or Brand or Torch. Our Prometheush, is fire lit by

38 **The Stage Francis Bacon's Province.**

Divine radiance, has enlightened, and still enlightens, the whole circuit of the earth. He tells us himself: I write for Posterity; and if we ask how so, he answers, Because the Gardens of the Muses keep the privilege of the Golden Age, they ever flourish and are in league with Time. Disease of the Mind was the matter, he says, with the world. Morality and Magnanimity were both lacking, so with participation of Divineness, he drew his archet or musical bow across his heart strings and let fly Dramatic Poesy, using the words of his wisdom as goads, and in so doing raised and erected minds cast down by depression or folly, or worse.

And his Monuments of wit truly have survived the Monuments of power. His Tragedies and Comedies have been the vehicle for truth which could not otherwise have been brought in. From most mean and sordid instances, Shylock, Macbeth, the King and Queen in Hamlet, Falstaff, valuable light and information has permeated; while Hamlet's, Henry V.'s, Cardinal Wolsley's, Portia's speeches, are they not extraordinary lights with the true properties of light that is conducting and comforting?

Francis writes to Cecil: Men are the best books. In his all-knowledge to medicine their natures he studied their diseases and infirmities, for if you know the causes, he says, you may judge of the effect. Good Lord! Madam, he said to Elizabeth, how wisely and aptly can you discern of Physic ministered to the body, and consider not that there is like occasion of Physic ministered to the mind.

To tune the curious harp of man's body and to reduce it to harmony was the gracious office of our Medicine Man, for no one better understood the agents by which mental diseases are cured than he.

Arts and Sciences were the occupation of his leisure

moments; see we understand the full meaning of the term. On page 171 of S. Augustine's *City of God*, we find that the old Writers called the Virtues, the *Art of Living Well*, or Prudences; for, says the note to this, The habit of living well is justly an *Art* as well as that whereby we play on instruments, wrestle, or make swords of apparel or anything. It was this *Art* which occupied Francis in his Twickenham Paradise.

The mind was what he set himself to work upon, the body to him above everything was the tabernacle of the mind. Unpolished, it produced distorted false images of things; this he calls Distemperature, and he bethinks himself of seeking out a remedy. *Legitimate forms* must be presented to the mind of Man so that better judgment may be induced, and so it was that Legitimate Drama came to the birth.

Our Medicine man called Momus to his aid, the god of Raillery and Ridicule, the critic god; who set his *pectus fenestratum*, his glass window, in the bosom of Human Nature so that every one might read his own mind there. Such a window, said Bacon, we have.

Black devices contrived in *tenebris* now appear palpably odious, the coals of festering malice blister the tongue and scald the lips of them that imagine mischief in their hearts. It is seen how they pack and shuffle, and cut, and deal, too.

God, the only searcher of the heart of man, inspired Francis Bacon, who with his Dramatical eye, seeing the world as a Theatre, and God and the Angels as lookers on, made a microscopic Globe, and set his players at work there, that all might behold as in a Theatre not only the hidden heart of Man, but God's Judgements.

S. Augustine says the word *Theatre* comes from to Behold, while Ordish in his Early London Theatres sees in it the Stage of God's Judgements.

Nature, says Quintilian (on whom Francis was fed from his cradle) is everything. Go to Nature for your Art; and Francis, the great student of Human Nature, as Hallam so enthusiastically proves, literally and actually held up the Mirror to it, and has reflected the life of Man as God and the Angels know it.

Thomas Lodge helps us wonderfully to understand this life-work. Study his Introduction to an "Alarum against Usurers" (1584) and bear in mind as you read of the hideous reign of Usury in England in the Sixteenth Century and of the Monsters who sucked the fortunes of the youth of the day, and were so cruel and stony-hearted that their bleeding got them the names of *Homicides*, how the Merchant of Venice parallels Lodge, and how Shylock was hammered out on the anvil.

Lodge, in his painting of "Diogenes, A Nettle for Nice Noses," presents a Dog that biteth men for their amendment and not for envy, who biting says: Hear me and I will heal wounds. A most significant saying. Lodge shakes his spear at the Usurer, too, "those men who are so married to their money are far from Mercy, and pretending cousinage will say, My friend, My friend, but . . . this friendly flattering thou shalt find but a weak staff" to stay on.

Diogenes says: what is not a virtue is against it, it is an ulcer and must be lanced, an ill humour and should be purged.

Lodge, as we have seen, uses the simile of the Looking-Glass. My Good Friend, he says, that are to enter hereafter into this world, look on this glass, it will show you no counterfail but the true image, and the reward . . . account yourselves happy to learn by others experience, and not to be partakers of the actual sorrow.

Socrates thought it was meet to expose oneself to

the Comic pen : for if they write true of our vice, they are a mean to reform us, if they write false it concerns both us. Lodge in his *Alarum* against Usurers says : My son muse not upon the world, for that will but flatter thee, but weigh the Judgement of God, and let that terrify thee.

Thus did the wisest and most learned of all the Romans present Stage Plays to the honour of their gods, as points and parts of their religion, and these, The City of God tells us, to flourish must not be laid in Hugger-mugger, but be wise, witty and memorative.

The Author then must be a Philosopher, a Laughing One, one who Finds out, who Knows. Francis Bacon commands that a Poet should not invent Fables and romances, not spin them like the spider from his entrails, but consult the Things themselves. Nor can (mark this speech of his, Stratfordians) any force of genius be substituted for labour, search and inspection. Nor, would I add, can an illiterate Clown ever produce exquisite fruit in literature, the results not only of genius, but of profound and patient cultivation and of the study, from childhood up, of Quintilian ; yes, but more, of his models and examples in their original tongue.

Because, by the Art of Memory, Images work better than other conceits, and because the Eye is the most spiritual of the senses, and because things good, and honest, and beauteous to the eye will retain its image in the Soul, and benefit, our Philosopher reflected his Counterfeits on his Mirror that *seeing, the offender might amend*. He polished his Crystal Globe and set it in movement, which, thank God ! has been so set in the firmament of Time that it has revolved on its ennobling, remedial axis ever since. Long may the Drama flourish, lit by the Lamp of Truth ! May its polished surface still ever show forth the greatest

Good, the Idea of Good, and what it is to be like God, just, wise and holy, and may it ever give me leave to be as merry as Francis Bacon however the world goes with me.

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

[N.B.—The words of Francis Bacon have been largely used, but quotation marks omitted.]

THE PROBLEM OF SHAKESPEARE'S MARRIAGE EXPLAINED BY THE CANON LAW.

THE marriage of William Shakespeare and Anne Hathaway is an accepted fact—although the marriage is not recorded in any parish register—but there is a problem concerning the marriage which has puzzled Shakespeare's biographers and has led them to put forward extravagant theories, owing to an insufficient consideration of the Canon Law which throws considerable light upon the problem.

The only official documents which exist relating to Shakespeare's marriage are two records, which are preserved in the Worcester Diocesan Registry, one of which relates to the granting of a marriage licence and the other is a marriage bond.

The entries are as follows :—

(1) On the 27th November, 1582, a *licence* was granted for the marriage of *William Shakspere* and *Anne Whateley, of Temple Grafton*.

(2) On the 28th November, 1582, a *bond* was entered into by Fulk Sandells and John Richardson, farmers, of Stratford, by way of security to the Bishop for licensing the marriage of *William Shagspere* and *Anne Hathwey, of Stratford*.

It is not at all improbable that "William Shakspeare" mentioned in the licence and "William Shagspere" in the bond may be the same individual, because the family of William Shakspeare, of Stratford, wrote their name in many different ways; and similarly "Hathwey" was interchangeable with "Hathaway," for there was no sort of regularity in the spelling of family names in Elizabethan times. But a difficulty has been found in reconciling the licence with the bond by reason of the discrepancy between "Anne Whateley, of Temple Grafton," and "Anne Hathwey, of Stratford."

Sir Sidney Lee, in his "Life of Shakespeare," regards it as "an unwarrantable assumption" that William Shakspeare, to whom the licence was granted, is the same individual whose licence is referred to in the bond which was entered into by the sureties on the following day; and he adopts the theory that the William Shakspeare in the licence is "doubtless another of the numerous William Shakespeares who abounded in the diocese of Worcester."

Mr. G. C. Bompas, on the other hand, in his "Problem of the Shakespeare Plays," prefers the theory that the licence and the bond have reference to the same man; but he draws the inference that William Shakspeare at first intended to marry Anne Whateley, of Temple Grafton, and that as soon as the licence was obtained the friends of Anne Hathaway of Stratford interfered, and insisted on seeing her "righted"; with the result that on the next day William Shakspeare applied for and obtained another marriage licence.

Neither of these theories appear to be convincing when they are examined in conjunction with the provisions of the Canon Law, which has apparently been overlooked to some extent by Shakespeare's biographers.

The Canon Law was administered in the Diocesan registry, where both the marriage licence was issued and the bond exhibited, and it is to the Canon Law that one must turn to find a more reasonable explanation of the difficulty. The Canons of 1603 are partly declaratory of the ancient Canon Law which prevailed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth ; and the 101st Canon recognised the exclusive right of the Bishop or his officers to grant a licence for the solemnization of marriage without the publication of banns. But the Canon also provided that no licence should be issued without security being taken and the form of the security was a bond entered into by sureties, who bound themselves under a penalty of a certain sum to indemnify the Bishop and his officers in respect of any consequences that might ensue, if it should afterwards be discovered that there was some legal impediment to the marriage.

It was essential, therefore, that the grant of a marriage licence should be accompanied by a bond, in order to protect the Bishop and his officers, in case there should be any irregularity in the marriage ; for the discovery of any impediment might lead to a prosecution of the Bishop's officers and the imposition of penalties.

Now there is considerable difficulty in believing that on the 27th November, 1582, William Shakspeare obtained a marriage licence without the security of any bond, which would be contrary to the Canon Law ; and that on the following day he found sureties who gave a bond in respect of another marriage licence, of which no record was made in the Diocesan registry.

On the other hand, it seems reasonable to suppose that when the licence was granted on the 27th November, the applicant was told that security must be given, and that the sureties must attend at the Diocesan

registry on the following day to enter into the bond, which was required by the Canon Law.

Of course, there is the natural observation that "Anne Whateley, of Temple Grafton" does not appear to be the same person as "Anne Hathway, of Stratford." But the little hamlet of Shottery, where Anne Hathaway resided, is only about three miles distant from Temple Grafton, although it is actually within the parish of Stratford. The description, therefore, of a person residing near Temple Grafton as being "of Temple Grafton" does not appear to be a very serious inaccuracy; and the name "Whateley" for "Hathway" might easily be a clerical error. It is certainly easier to imagine a clerical error with regard to these two somewhat similar names—with the exception of e, l, and h, the letters are the same—than to suppose that a licence was improperly granted without a bond, and that on the next day a bond was entered into as security for a licence, which was not duly recorded in the Diocesan registry. The omission of the bond would be a breach of the law on the part of the Bishop's officer, and the neglect to record the licence would be an irregularity for which the registrar might get into serious trouble.

There is something very curious about the form of the bond, which is set out in Mr. Halliwell Phillips' "Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare" (Vol. II., p. 55, 7th ed.). It not only differs in important respects from that adopted in all other known examples, but it does not comply with the requirements of the Canon Law.

The 102nd Canon requires that the bond shall contain three conditions, viz. :—

(1) That there is no impediment of precontract, consanguinity, affinity, or other lawful cause.

(2) That there is no controversy or suit pending in any ecclesiastical court touching the marriage of either party with any other.

(3) *That the parties have obtained the express consent of their parents or guardians.*

In the Shakspeare marriage bond the third condition only provides for obtaining the consent of the "friends" of the wife, and there is no mention of the consent of the parents of the husband, although he was a minor and his parents were living.

Considerable comment has been made upon the moral aspect of Shakespeare's marriage, because it could not have been solemnized before the 27th November, 1582, when the licence was granted, and the first child of the marriage was baptized on the 26th May, 1583, that is to say, within six months of the marriage ceremony. On this part of the subject, Sir Sidney Lee disagrees with the view of Mr. Halliwell Phillips, whose contention, however, appears to be more consistent with the Canon Law.

Sir Sidney Lee observes that "Shakespeare's apologists have endeavoured to show that the public betrothal or formal 'troth-plight,' which was at the time a common prelude to a wedding, carried with it all the privileges of a marriage"; and he appears to think that there is little foundation for the contention of Mr. Halliwell Phillips that the marriage of Shakespeare was the sequel of what was legally termed a precontract.

But according to the Canon Law, which regulated marriage in those days, there were two kinds of precontract :—

(1) The contract *per verba de praesenti*, and

(2) The contract *per verba de futuro*.

The *sponsa de praesenti* was a mutual promise or contract of present matrimony; and if either party

afterwards refused to marry the other, the party refusing might be proceeded against in the Diocesan court, and if he or she disobeyed the order of the Ecclesiastical judge to solemnize the marriage, the penalty was excommunication, and in the last resort imprisonment.

The *sponsa de futuro*, on the other hand, was a mutual promise or covenant of marriage to take effect at some subsequent time; and if either party broke the promise they were not compelled to marry merely on account of the promise, but the defaulter could only be admonished by the Ecclesiastical judge and suffered penance for breach of his promise. In the case of a *sponsa de futuro*, however, if there was cohabitation—"if the contract be executed and he does take her"—then it was regarded as a precontract and the parties might be compelled to solemnize the marriage.

In Shakespeare's case we know that the contract was "executed," prior to the solemnization of the marriage. There is certainly good ground, therefore, for the contention that Shakespeare's marriage followed a precontract, and the circumstances do not appear to have been of an exceptional character in those days.

"The precontract," as Mr. Halliwell Phillips states, "was not only legally recognised, but it invalidated a subsequent union of either of the parties with anyone else." In the Diocesan registries there are numbers of records of suits in the Ecclesiastical courts where a party to a marriage precontract has been ordered to solemnize the marriage in church with the other party, in spite of the fact that he or she had married somebody else, and there were children of the marriage.

In a case for a prohibition, in the reign of Queen Anne, Chief Justice Holt said, "By the Canon Law,

48 Problem of Shakespeare's Marriage.

a contract *per verba de praesenti* is a marriage, so is a contract *per verba de futuro* if the contract be executed and he does take her ; this is a marriage, and they cannot punish for fornication, but only for not solemnizing the marriage according to the forms prescribed by law, but not so as to declare the marriage void." (Wigmore's case, 2 salkeld, 438.)

The law was altered in this respect by the Marriage Act of 1753, which provides that no suit or proceeding shall be had in any ecclesiastical court, in order to compel a celebration of any marriage in *facie ecclesiae*, by reason of any contract of marriage, whether *per verba de praesenti* or *per verba de futuro*. From that date down to the present time the remedy has been an action for damages in the secular courts for breach of promise of marriage.

HAROLD HARDY.

SOME NOTES ON THOMAS WATSON.

IN a work entitled *Polimanteia* &c., by W. C., dedicated to the Earl of Essex, and published at Cambridge in 1595, Shakespeare is mentioned among the university poets. It also connects in a literary sense Watson, Marlowe and Shakespeare. After a careful consideration of the internal and external evidence of authorship of the works ascribed to these names, my conclusion is that Francis Bacon dispersed his poetry under them. The passage is as follows :—

	Let other countries (sweet <i>Cambridge</i>) enuie, (yet admire) my <i>Virgil</i> , thy Pet- rarch, diuine <i>Spenser</i> . And unlesse I erre, (a thing easie in such sim- plicitie) deluded by dearlie beloued <i>Delia</i> , and fortunatelie fortunate <i>Cleopatra</i> ; <i>Oxford</i> thou maiest extoll thy courte-deare-verse hap- pie Daniell, whose sweete refined muse, in contracted shape, were sufficient amongst men to gaine pardon of the sinne to <i>Rosemond</i> , pittie to distressed <i>Cleopatra</i> , and euerliuing praiseto her louing <i>Delia</i>	Wanton Adonis. Watson's heyre.
--	--	---

Wanton "Venus and Adonis" was, of course, Shakespeare's "heyre." He dedicated the poem to Southampton as "the first heir of my invention." Marlowe's "Edward II." ("Eloquent Gaueston" is, I presume, an allusion to Marlowe) was first printed in 1594, of which edition only one copy is extant. It was discovered in the library at Cassel in 1876.

"It gives one to think," to find Watson, Marlowe, and Shakespeare connected in this way. Exactly what the notes are intended to convey is not at all clear. Some have supposed that Shakespeare is

named as Watson's heir. But neither "Lucrece" nor "Venus and Adonis" bear any resemblance in form, to the writings published under the name of "Watson." The latter's amatory numbers are, for the most part, sonnets in which their author rails against Love in such a style as this :—

Loue is a sowr delight ; a sugred greefe ;
 A liuinge death ; an euerdyng life ;
 A breache of *Reasons* lawe ; a secret theefe ;
 A sea of teares ; an euerlasting strife ;
 A bayte for fooles : a scourge of noble witts ;
 A Deadly wound ; a shotte which euer hitts.
Loue is a blinded God ; an angry boye ;
 A *Labyrinth* of dowbts ; an ydle lust ;
 A slaue to Beawties will ; a witles toy ;
 A rauening bird, a tyraunt most unsuit ;
 A burning heate ; A cold ; a flattring foe ;
 A priuate hell ; a very world of woe.
 Yet mightie *Loue* regard not what I saye,
 Which lye in traunce bereft of all my witts,
 But blame the light that leades me thus astraye.
 And makes my tongue blaspheme by frantike fitts :
 Yet hurt her not, lest I susteyne the smart,
 Which am content to lodge her in my heart.

On the subject of Love, Shakespeare and Bacon wrote to the same effect as Watson.

W(illiam) C(lerke) ?, the author of *Polimanteia*, was at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1575-1579, and must have come in contact with Francis Bacon.

Thomas Edwardes, in "L'Envoy to Cephalus and Procris" published in 1595 (that in the library of Peterborough Cathedral is the only copy extant), mentions Spenser ("Collyn"), Daniel ("Rosamond"), Watson ("Amyntas"), Marlowe ("Leander"), and Shakespeare ("Adon.") This is the same list as those named in *Polimanteia*. There is much in Edwardes' poem which is ambiguous. After referring to Spenser, the verses read :—

Deale we not with *Rosamond*,
For the world our sawe will coate,
Amintas and *Leander's* gone,
Oh deere sonnes of stately kings,
Blessed be your nimble throats
That so amorously could sing.

Adon deafly masking thro,
Stately troupes rich conceited,
Shew'd he well deserved to
Love's delight on him to gaze
And had not love her selfe intreated,
Other nymphs had sent him baies.

Eke in purple roabes distain'd,
Amidst the center of this clime,
I have heard saie doth remaine,
One whose power floweth far.
That should have been of our rime
The only object and the star.

Well could his bewitching pen,
Done the Muses objects to us
Although he differs much from men
Tilting under Frieries,
Yet his golden art might woo us
To have honored him with baies.

Watson and Marlowe are coupled together in the same line and, if we are to take *Amintas* and *Leander* as referring to *two* poets, instead of *one* and the same writer, it is distinctly bad grammar to set down "*Amintas* and *Leander's* gone."

What "stately troupes" did Shakespeare deftly mask through? Queen Elizabeth's courtiers? "Purple robes" certainly suggests the highest society, if not royalty itself. And who is it,

That should have been of our rime
The only object and the star?

It is only natural to recall Ben Jonson's lines, "To the author, Mr. William Shakespeare," written for the Play-folio, where he says:—

But stay ! I see thee in the hemisphere,
Advanced, and made a constellation there,
Shine forth thou starre of poets !

And what does Edwardes mean when he says this poet "differs much from men tilting under Frieries?" Were those from which he differed the tilters, or is the word "by" understood? The lines might mean that he differs because of his "Tilting under Frieries." We are not far from Francis Bacon here. There was a notable Friar of the name of Bacon, a conjurer and sorcerer, like the organizer of the Gray's Inn Revels in December, 1594. "Frieries" also suggests *Franciscans*, and *Hoods*! *Adon*, we read, deftly *masked* himself, and I feel certain that Edwardes knew who was the Shake-speare who wrote "Venus and Adonis," and that the last three verses refer to one and the same poet.

The identity of this Thomas Edwardes has never been established with certainty. One of the "probables," however, was a Cambridge man:—B.A. 1578, M.A. 1582.

"Watson" is merely a pen-name. Nothing is known of him beyond what can be gleaned from the writings, and, such as this evidence is, it points to Francis Bacon. Watson describes himself in his publications as a law student ("Londinensis Juris Studiosus"). He was resident in France prior to 1581, and associated there with Sir Francis Walsingham, and after the latter's death, recalled how Sir Francis delighted in Watson's "tunes." "Tityrus" (Walsingham) is made to say:—

Thy tunes haue often pleas'd mine eare of yoare,
 When milk-white swans did flocke to heare thee sing,
 Where *Seane* in *Paris* makes a double shoare,
Paris thrise blest is shee obey her King.

The poems prove the vast learning of their author, who had digested the Greek, Latin, French and Italian classics. He tells of the time and study he had given to the art of cypher writing, when explaining the working of the cipher Sonnet on the motto "Amare est insanire." He says:—

All such as are but of indifferent capacitie, and have some skill in *Arithmetike*, by viewing this Sonnet following compiled by rule and number, into the forme of a piller, may soone judge, howe much art and study the Author hath bestowed in the same. Wherein as there are placed many preaty observations, so these which I will set downe, may be marked for the principall, if any man haue such idle leasure to looke it ouer, as the Author had, when he framed it.

Watson refers to his Sonnets entitled "The Tears of Fancie, or Loue Disdained" (1593), as "idle lines unpolisht." Bacon said he prepared a Sonnet to bring about the Queen's reconcilment to the Earl of Essex, adding "thou I preffess not to be a poet"; while Shakespeare describes his "Venus and Adonis" (1593), as my "unpolisht lines"!

Stratfordians often say that Bacon could not have kept his poetical excursions a secret. The truth is that there were quite a number who knew all about it, as the following list (which is not complete) will show:—

Sir John Davies, in his Sonnet addressed to Bacon in "The Scourge of Folly" (ca. 1610).

Thomas Campion in his Epigrams (1619), Epigram No. 190, commends "Dulcis Musa (Bacone)"!

Ben Jonson in "Poetaster" (1601) and "Discoveries" (1641).

Thomas Powell Addresses Bacon as *Seneca*: see dedication to "Attorney's Academy" (1630).

Henry Peacham, Emblems in "Minerva Britannia" (1612).

Edmund Waller in the Dedication of his Poems (1645), mentions Bacon among the "nightingales who sang only in the Spring, as the diversion of their youth."

The anonymous author of "The Great Assizes holden in Parnassus" (1645), who makes Bacon "Chancellor of Parnassus."

About 25 writers of the "Manes Verulamiani" (1626), among them:—

Thomas Randolph (the dramatist) of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Bishop Williams of Lincoln.

William Boswell.

George Herbert.

William, Loe, James Duport, and several unnamed members of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Not a bad list! The time will come when these references to Bacon as a Poet, now carefully avoided by literary "experts" (experts in the art of concealing Truth!) will be "discovered," and cherished as "allusions to Shakespeare."

And what of Bacon's reference to Sir John Davies, in 1603, as to "concealed poets"; and his letter to Essex, when he was thirty-five, where he says how "the Waters of Parnassus" have quenched his appetite for Office; the veiled allusions in letters to Sir Tobie Matthew in which Bacon sends Measure for Measure, and tells of certain works of his recreation; Bodley's admonition of Bacon with regard to certain "toys" with which his pen had been occupied?

And what is the reason for the omission by Gruter of certain passages in Bacon's "Cogitata et Visa" relating to the missing (?) Fourth Part of the Great Instauration, which was to deal with the human passions? As Edwin Reed, in "Francis Bacon, our Shakespeare" has shown, the comparison of Gruter's publication with the MS. at Oxford, reveals the startling fact that the suppressed portions unquestionably describe the method and purpose of the Shakespeare Plays.

"The Baconian Theory is not worth a moment's consideration"; that is the retort Baconians usually get. And, after all, it is the safest way out for a party which knows it has no chance of escape if it meet its opponents in the open field.

R. EAGLE.



NOTES.

TITLE OF SHAKE-SPEARE'S TEMPEST.

Miss A. A. Leith points out that it is important to note the way Tempest and Sea are used metaphorically by Shake-Speare, Thomas Lodge and Bacon. Hamlet speaks of a Sea of Trouble. In "Nettle for Nice Noses," by Thomas Lodge, we find "suddenly surprised with a huge Tempest in midst of the Ocean Sea, for in sooth the combat of the flesh is a true Tempest and Storm."

While Francis Bacon says in an argument on Law: "The Act of God, a Tempest;" and of Man, "His approach or assumption of Divine or Angelical Nature is the Perfection of his form, the error or false imitation of which good is that which is the Tempest of human life" (page 274, Adv. of Learning).

Seeing what a sermon on this subject is Calaban, it

may be concluded that from living rock the title of *The Tempest* was hewn.

Only one lecture has been delivered during the quarter. On November 20th, Mrs. Bunten read a paper at her studio in Hogarth Road, on Sir Thomas Meautys. It was followed by considerable discussion.

A correspondent sends particulars of an interesting incident which occurred recently.

A lady in the course of a lecture delivered on *Shakespeare* dismissed the Baconian theory as to authorship with the remark that it was not worth a moment's consideration. A member of the audience, convinced that the remark was occasioned by ignorance, sent her several books with the request that she would peruse them. The books were returned accompanied by a letter which read:—

"I wish I had known of these books you kindly lent me before I wrote my paper. Having to give it again next month at Catford, it has been impossible for me to dip largely into the volumes, as I am afraid all my ideas on Shakespeare as the writer of the plays would be altered—then where would my paper be? It would mean that, as it stands, it would be useless. After all, nobody knows, or can ever know now the real facts."

This is by no means an isolated case. It is not an unfrequent occurrence for some staunch Shakespearean to refuse to read a book in which the Stratford myth is laid bare, on the ground that he would prefer not to have his opinions unsettled.